

**Status of the Claims**

Claims 41-52 are pending herein, claims 41, 46 and 50 being the independent claims.

**Remarks**

In the Advisory Action mailed September 30, 2008, the Examiner states that the request for reconsideration has been considered but does not place the application in condition for allowance because the limitations have been previously addressed and thus Applicant's arguments are not deemed persuasive. The Examiner goes on to say that "in particular, the limitation 'system-originated delay' was not included in the claims."

It is respectfully brought to the Examiner's attention that the limitations "system-generated" or "processor-generated" delay are indeed included in each of the presently pending independent claims (claims 41, 46, and 50), supported by the specification, and discussed in the Applicant's remarks in the Response to the Final Office Action.

More specifically, the second element in claim 41 recites "processing the real time live video stream by imposing a surveillance system-generated delay of a pre-set time interval on the live video stream to generate a time-delayed video stream ..." (emphasis added).

The second element in claim 46 recites "delaying the real time video stream by a system-generated pre-set time interval to create a time delayed video stream ..." (emphasis added).

The second element in claim 50 recites "a processor to process data representative of the received real time video stream and for writing the data to storage and reading the data from storage so as to create a time delayed version of the real time video stream that is delayed by a processor-generated pre-set time interval that is greater than about 5 seconds ..." (emphasis added).

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing remarks and the Applicant remarks previously filed, and that it appears that the Examiner may have inadvertently overlooked the claim limitations discussed above, and as a result, did not fully consider the applicant's remarks in light of them, the undersigned submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and early passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes there are still unresolved issues, a telephone call to the undersigned would be welcomed.

**Fees**

The \$245 extension fee, \$405 RCE Fee and any additional fees that may be due and owing in respect to this amendment, may be charged to the undersigned attorney's PTO Deposit Account number 50-1047.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark K. Young, Reg. # 38,666/

---

Mark K. Young  
Registration No. 38,666

Attorney for Applicants  
Mayer & Williams PC  
251 North Avenue West, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Westfield, NJ 07090  
(908) 518-7700 Tel.  
(908) 518-7795 Fax

**Certificate of Electronic Transmission Under  
37 C.F.R. §1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence and any document referenced herein are being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on 01/21/2009.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Marjorie Scariati  
(Printed Name of Person Sending  
Correspondence)

\_\_\_\_\_  
/Marjorie Scariati/  
(Signature)